



**University of
Zurich**^{UZH}

**Zurich Open Repository and
Archive**

University of Zurich
University Library
Strickhofstrasse 39
CH-8057 Zurich
www.zora.uzh.ch

Year: 2005

Explaining article grammaticalization in Old Italian

Stark, Elisabeth

Posted at the Zurich Open Repository and Archive, University of Zurich

ZORA URL: <https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-33295>

Book Section

Published Version

Originally published at:

Stark, Elisabeth (2005). Explaining article grammaticalization in Old Italian. In: Pusch, C D; Kabatek, J; Raible, W. Romanistische Korpuslinguistik II: Korpora und diachrone Sprachwissenschaft. Tübingen: Narr, 455-468.

Claus D. Pusch / Johannes Kabatek / Wolfgang Raible
(Hrsg.)

Romanistische Korpuslinguistik II Romance Corpus Linguistics II

Korpora und diachrone Sprachwissenschaft
Corpora and Diachronic Linguistics

Sonderdruck

2005



Gunter Narr Verlag Tübingen

Elisabeth Stark (Berlin)

Explaining article grammaticalization in Old Italian

Cet article a pour but d'expliquer de manière fonctionnelle l'apparition et la grammaticalisation des déterminants nominaux indéfinis (article indéfini et article 'partitif') dans les langues romanes. La perte du système de la déclinaison nominale en latin tardif est réinterprétée comme une perte d'un système de *classification nominale* au sens large, basé sur des combinaisons significatives des marques de genre, de nombre et de classe de déclinaison en latin. Une étude empirique, basée sur l'analyse distributionnelle de l'article indéfini, de l'article 'partitif' et des syntagmes nominaux non-déterminés dans un corpus de textes d'ancien toscan, révèle la distribution classificatoire de ces trois possibilités de détermination indéfinie, qui semble avoir remplacé l'ancien système classificatoire latin: l'article indéfini, de part sa nature numérale, accompagne des syntagmes nominaux comptables, l'article 'partitif' des syntagmes nominaux non-comptables, et les syntagmes nominaux indéterminés possèdent, dans la plupart des cas, un 'nom abstrait' comme noyau lexical.

1. The problem: (Indefinite) articles between DETERMINATION and APPREHENSION

The object of this study is the emergence of indefinite articles in (Old) Italian, situated in the larger context of one of the most intensely discussed problems of diachronic Romance linguistics, i.e. why does (Old) Italian like all other Romance languages possess articles while Latin does not (cf. Werner 1998: 381)? This 'classical' problem will be treated here exclusively in the realm of *indefinites*, the emergence of definite determiners being already largely discussed elsewhere (cf. Selig 1992 for Late Latin and early stages of Romance, Leiss 2000 for Germanic languages).

In order to answer this question, we consider as crucial a functional perspective. We will attempt to describe the *distribution* of indefinite determiners in early Romance, more precisely in Old Tuscan texts (13th to 16th centuries), in order to discover their original *function* and thus to avoid erroneously applying functional categories derived from article distribution in languages with fully grammaticalized article systems (e.g. the modern standard Romance languages), a methodological error that obscures the original function of determiners in early Romance and thereby the reason for their emergence.

1.1 DETERMINATION and APPREHENSION

Discussing articles leads inevitably to the universal functional dimensions of DETERMINATION and APPREHENSION, set up in the work of Hansjakob Seiler (cf. Seiler 1978, 1986). On the level of individual historical languages, we can state the following facts: indefinite elements usually grammaticalize later than definite ones (cf. Selig 1992, van Kemenade / Vincent 1997 etc.) and do not emerge as the functional counterpart of definite determiners (cf. Christoffersen 1939, Coseriu 1955, Moravcsik 1969, Hawkins 1978 etc.). On the universal level of human language, we have to deal with the following universal operations which speakers have to realize while communicating: they have to indicate REFERENCE understood here as the construction of a discourse object (cf. Forsgren 2001), which can be, but does not have to be, done via NOMINAL DETERMINATION (cf. Seiler 1978), understood as the process of the 'actualization' of a concept, as the transformation of a virtual lexical unit into a referring phrase in a text (cf. Coseriu 1955; it is conceived more or less as "determination of reference", cf. Seiler 1978: 319). Determination of Reference is one aspect of NOMINAL APPREHENSION (cf. Lehmann 1991 and especially Seiler 1986), defined in the following way:

First of all, so it seems, one has to be able to express that something is a thing [= dimension of APPREHENSION, E.S.]. Only then can it be named: The dimension of NAMING [...] Following that, it can be referenced: The dimension of DETERMINATION. (Seiler 1986: 9)

APPREHENSION is the universal operational dimension with corresponding sub-dimensions which explicate the grasping and representation of concepts corresponding to objects or things by means of language. (Seiler 1986: 145)

With these definitions in mind, we introduce the following important terminological distinctions within the field of NOMINAL DETERMINATION and APPREHENSION: First, one has to distinguish between DETERMINATION vs. NON-DETERMINATION, i.e. between explicit indication of reference and the absence of this indication: explicit NOMINAL DETERMINATION is not a universal category and absent for example in Mandarin or Classical Latin. Second, there can be a grammaticalized device in some languages for the indication of DEFINITENESS vs. INDEFINITENESS as a *textual semantic category* of noun phrases, corresponding, at least in argument position, largely to 'familiarity' vs. 'newness in the text' (cf. Heim 1988, Kamp / Reyle 1993).

Coming back to our initial question, we can see clearly that articles as grammaticalized devices to indicate NOMINAL DETERMINATION and / or (IN-)DEFINITENESS are a genuine new category in Romance (cf. Nocentini 1990, Selig 1992). They differ from other nominal determiners by their obligatory presence in noun phrases in *argument position* (in the majority of the Romance languages at least in *singular count noun phrases*), their fixed position in the noun phrase, their inability to fill any syntactic position alone, especially the predicative (cf. Himmelmann 2001). What is important here is the fact that articles in *indefinite noun phrases* in Romance are subject to cer-

tain distributional restrictions. In fact, *number* and *noun class* seem to be decisive, which also holds true in a diachronic and comparative perspective: (indefinite) determiners appear usually first with noun phrases with concrete referents, only later or seldom with abstract referents and show a special distributional behavior with *mass nouns* or with *plural* noun phrases.

1.2 Two major theses to explain article grammaticalization in Romance

To explain the emergence of article systems in Romance, there exist two major theses in the scientific literature dedicated to the subject. First, there is one approach, which we could call 'morphosyntactic' or structural, and which considers the loss of case inflexion as the origin of articles ('compensation hypothesis') – a thesis not at all confirmed e.g. by the results of Selig, based on a huge corpus of late Latin texts (cf. Selig 1992: 31–77). The other approach could be called 'referential' and considers the explicit marking of SPECIFICITY¹ by nominal determiners in the early phase of article grammaticalization as a textual focalization / foregrounding strategy (cf. Selig 1992) which would be fundamental when it comes to the emergence of systems of nominal determiners: Noun phrases with SPECIFIC interpretation seem to be more likely to be explicitly determined than NON-SPECIFIC ones (cf. Blazer 1979, Heinz 1982 for Old French, Elvira 1994 for Old Spanish or Selig 1992 for late Latin, Stark 2002 for Old Italian; see especially Givón 1981 who claims this to be universal in the grammaticalization from the numeral 'one' to an indefinite marker). Now, even if this may hold for *definite* noun phrases,² it does not explain the emergence of *indefinite* determiners, as, in general, indefinite articles are not necessary to indicate DETERMINATION, SPECIFICITY or (IN-)DEFINITENESS: the mere absence of definite determiners would be sufficient (and, accordingly, only 8% of the world's languages possess definite and indefinite articles, cf. Dryer 1989, Haspelmath 2001).

1.3 NOMINAL APPREHENSION, COUNTABILITY and 'classification' from Latin to Romance

Going back to the etymological source of the indefinite article in Romance, the Latin numeral *unus* ('one'), we discover that determination by this numeral *unus* can be used to *indirectly* indicate non-identity between one

1 Without going into details of the broad discussion about SPECIFICITY, it should be understood informally here as the basic referential distinction between 'one particular entity' (= SPECIFICITY) and 'any arbitrary member of the class' (= NON-SPECIFICITY) (cf. Lyons 1999: 165).

2 And still it does not become clear in this approach why at one stage, SPECIFICITY marking should become obligatory, while it has not been so for hundreds of years in Latin.

member of a class and the other members of a class (with presupposed existence: *quidam*, *aliquis*) and thus as a device to produce REFERENTIALITY via explicit DETERMINATION and thereby to introduce new text referents. But what it does first of all is to indicate 'singularity' and 'contour' by its very original meaning as a numeral – it indicates *one* 'percept', a representative of a concept, and thereby COUNTABILITY (cf. Meisterfeld 2000, also Leiss 2000).

COUNTABILITY (cf. Krifka 1991, Löbel 1993, Behrens 1995) is a notion which concerns at least two different basic levels of description: a) it can describe a special lexical noun class formed by shared characteristics of the potential (extralinguistic) referents: the so-called "entity-denoting nouns" like ital. *macchina* vs. the class of "mass-denoting nouns" like ital. *acqua* (cf. Allan 1980); b) it describes a grammatical, morpho-syntactic category of indefinite noun phrases, characterized by the possibility to have a morphological plural and / or to show compatibility with certain *indefinite determiners* (French: *un* vs. *du* / Italian: *uno* vs. *del*). Neither level satisfies universal classes or morphosyntactic characteristics, especially the second one is not universal, but typologically relevant. In languages with a grammaticalized COUNTABILITY distinction on the level of noun phrases, virtually any noun can appear in any type of noun phrase (cf. ital.: *Avete del vino?* – *Hanno ottimi vini, qua.*), with certain affinities and semantic 'recategorization effects'.³ It is in this second sense that COUNTABILITY will be used in this paper.

Now, there are three language types according to NOMINAL DETERMINATION and COUNTABILITY as shown in the work of Gil 1987 (cf. also Lyons 1999 and 2000): Type I shows no explicit marking of (IN-)DEFINITENESS, but (numeral) classifiers, no configurationality, no obligatory morphological number marking and no COUNTABILITY-distinction, no personal verbal inflexion, no personal pronouns, e.g. Japanese. Type II shows again no obligatory explicit marking of (IN-)DEFINITENESS, possible 'classification' by a complex declension class and gender system; contrary to type I, it has obligatory morphological number marking, personal verbal inflexion, personal pronouns, e.g. Latin. Type III shows obligatory marking of (IN-)DEFINITENESS in argument position, no classifiers, obligatory morphological number marking, COUNTABILITY distinction, personal verbal inflexion, personal pronouns, e.g. the modern Romance languages. In this typology, the main difference between Latin and Romance lies in NOMINAL DETERMINATION and, for indefinites, in NOMINAL CLASSIFICATION. NOMINAL CLASSIFICATION is one major aspect of NOMINAL APPREHENSION (see above) and concerns the classification of a textual referent as a „partikulären Vertreter der Klasse der konturierten Gegenstände“ ('a particular representative of the designated class of objects', Meisterfeld 2000: 328) – an aspect completely absent in the field of demonstratives, possessives etc., i.e. definite determiners.

3 Cf. Behrens (1995: 47–50), Corbett (2000: 86f.); cf. the sortal interpretation or "Artenplural" mentioned by Krifka (1991: 414f.) for "mass-denoting nouns" in countable plural NPs and the unique meaning of the morphological plural in languages with grammaticalized COUNTABILITY: it is always understood as additive, „diskrete Gesamtheiten von Objekten derselben Art“, cf. Link (1991: 418).

That Latin is to be classified as a language of type II can be shown by re-considering the Latin declension system in its referential (not morphosyntactic) functional aspects: there is NOMINAL CLASSIFICATION (indication of 'class', 'substance' or 'individualized object') via noun and declension class, gender (cf. Seiler 1986) and number (cf. Lehmann 1991). For example, in the singular we have a rather clear-cut opposition between masculine or feminine gender indicating "entity-denoting" (*caseus* 'one [sort of] cheese', *olea* 'one olive or olive tree'), while the same lexical stem in the neuter indicates „mass-denoting“ (*caseum* 'cheese' [as a substance], *oleum* 'olive oil'). Furthermore, the plural neuter very often has a collective meaning with "entity-denoting nouns" (*acina* 'grape' to *acinum* 'berry') and so on. But still there is no morphosyntactic COUNTABILITY distinction in Latin, there are no restrictions of plural marking, frequent plural occurrences of "mass-denoting nouns" and / or 'abstract nouns' with different meanings of the morphological plural (repetition or intensity with 'abstract nouns' or homogeneous substance in many different forms: *acquae*, etc. [cf. Hofmann / Szantyr 1997 [1965]: 9–21, 194–210, Kühner / Stegmann 1955: 73–89, Meisterfeld 1998: 114–119, 126]).

Now what happens if a language of type II loses its declension system? The reduction of declension classes and restrictions of clear gender and number morphemes inside the NP in late Latin and early Romance leads to a loss of the 'NOMINAL CLASSIFICATION morphemes', together with a reduction to only one meaning of the morphological plural (additive) and a dramatic loss of clear number marking (cf. Gaeng 1990, Schultz-Gora 1973: 65ff. for Old Occitan, Buridant 2000: 73 and 119 for Old French and so on) – and this last feature is *unacceptable for argument NPs in languages of type II* (see above).

This together with the introductory remarks about DETERMINATION and APPREHENSION as universal and fundamental dimensions in the operation of REFERENCE marking leads to the following hypothesis: the initial determination of indefinite singular NPs by *unus* can be seen as the beginning of a 'COUNTABILITY grammaticalization process', as the gradual grammaticalization of NOMINAL CLASSIFICATION (together with NOMINAL DETERMINATION and configurationality) in Romance. In order to corroborate this hypothesis, we have to look at stages of early Romance, in our case at Old Italian / Tuscan, to find the exact distribution of bare singulars and bare plurals vs. nominal phrases with *uno* and with the 'partitive article', which we expect to show a clear tendency towards a 'CLASSIFICATION system' via DETERMINATION.

2. The Data Base – the corpus

In order to analyze the distribution of bare NPs, *uno*- and partitive-NPs in Old Tuscan in a variety of different texts and periods, we chose 9 texts from the 14th to the 16th century, subdivided into three text groups (novellas, historio-

graphy, expository-argumentative texts) and three periods (*Trecento*, *Quattrocento*, *Cinquecento*), as shown in table 1:

	1250–1350 (= <i>Trecento</i>)	1350–1450 (= <i>Quattrocento</i>)	1450–1550 (= <i>Cinquecento</i>)
Novellas	<i>Il Novellino</i> (anonymous) 1280–1300 (27.029 words)	<i>Il Decameron</i> (Giovanni Boccaccio) written in its major parts after 1348 (269.588 words)	<i>Il Novellino</i> (Masuccio Salernitano) 1440–1475/76 (135.102 words)
Historiography	<i>Nuova Cronica</i> (Giovanni Villani) 1308–1348 (481.607 words)	<i>Ricordi di Giovanni di Pagolo Morelli</i> (Giovanni Morelli) 1393–1411 (372.628 words)	<i>Istorie fiorentine</i> (Niccolò Machiavelli) 1519–1525 (147.424 words)
Expository-argumentative texts (philosophy, linguistic and sociological discussion)	<i>Il Convivio</i> (Dante Alighieri) 1304–1307 (73.236 words)	<i>I Libri della famiglia</i> (Leon Battista Alberti) 1433/34–1436/37 or 1440, final compilation 1475/1476 (118.638 words)	<i>Prose della volgar lingua</i> (Pietro Bembo) written from 1512 on, published in 1525 (67.590 words)

Table 1. The corpus texts

The analyzed items for this study are up to 200 occurrences of *uno* and the partitive in each text plus 100 bare singular and 100 bare plural noun phrases chosen randomly in each text (not taking into account occurrences in typical ‘zero’ contexts like coordination, scope of direct negation, GENERIC reference, attributive or predicative function).

3. Indefinite determiners and lexical classes in Old Italian

If we have a closer look at the data in table 2 and 3 in the appendix (p. 467s.), we discover a rather clear-cut distribution of *uno*, the partitive and ‘zero’ in singular and plural noun phrases in the three periods and three text groups of our corpus texts.

3.1 The diachronic dimension

In the singular (cf. table 2; p. 467), *uno* (*un’*, *una*) appears only in up to 5% of all occurrences of “mass-denoting nouns” with a slightly decreasing tendency towards the *Cinquecento*, and only about a third of the occurrences of “abstract nouns” as lexical heads of the respective noun phrases are found with *uno*, with a slightly increasing tendency towards the *Cinquecento*. The partitive singular *del* with its allomorphs *dello*, *dell’* and the feminine *della*, still quite rare in our corpus texts in absolute numbers, is found in between 70% and 100% of the occurrences of “mass-denoting nouns”. This lexical class, however, is in singular NPs still possible without explicit determination (‘zero’), ranging from 23% to 7% of its occurrences, with a clear decreasing tendency in the three periods.

The partitive plural (cf. table 3, p. 467) occurs mainly with “entity-denoting nouns”, but also with “abstract nouns” (9% in the *Trecento*, 26% in the *Quattrocento*).

‘Zero’ seems to mark clearly “abstract nouns”; this lexical class is found continuously in about 70% of its occurrences in the singular and less frequently in the plural (from 32% to 48%) in bare noun phrases. Non-determination with “mass-denoting nouns” decreases in general significantly from the *Trecento* (24%) to the *Cinquecento* (7%).

3.2 The ‘text-type’ dimension

Working on written texts from remote periods of the past demands systematic reflexion on the methodological implications of this kind of corpora: mere collections of texts (accessible now in so-called ‘electronic corpora’) are not already *corpora* in a strict methodological sense. Collections of texts turn into valuable databases only through an adequate identification and interpretation of the ‘discourse traditions’ represented in one or more texts from the original ‘text collection’. Adequate corpora are thus the *result* of an *active and reflected choice of texts* by the diachronically working linguist (cf. Oesterreicher 2001b: 1569).

After these introductory remarks, we can now have a look at the data presented in tables 4 and 5 in the appendix (p. 467s.). The occurrences of *uno* with “mass-denoting nouns” are extremely rare in novellas and in historiographical texts, whereas slightly more than 6% of “mass-denoting nouns” appear in noun phrases determined by *uno* in the expository-argumentative texts. *Uno* is found with 24% to 32% of abstract nouns, again with the exception of expository-argumentative texts, where almost half of the occurrences of “abstract nouns” as lexical heads show determination by *uno*. The domain of the partitive singular is again the determination of “mass-denoting nouns”, except for this last mentioned text group (normally clearly more than 70%).

The importance of 'zero' in the singular for "abstract nouns" increases from the novellas (60%) to the expository-argumentative texts (82%).

As for the indefinite plural noun phrases, the data in table 5 look quite similar to those in table 3, with one exception: in the novellas, the plural partitive with "abstract nouns", which occur frequently in bare noun phrases, is almost as frequent as 'zero' in relative numbers (30% vs. 34%).

3.3 Discussion

What can we conclude from the data presented in tables 2 to 5 and commented in chapter 3.1 and 3.2?

First of all, the morphological plural of the partitive, *dei* (*degli*, *delle*), seems to be the functional equivalent of *uno*, rather than of its morphologically corresponding singular, as it does not appear with "mass-denoting nouns" and quite rarely with "abstract nouns" – it is specialized in "entity-denoting nouns" with highly SPECIFIC referents, just like *uno*, as can be shown in example (1) below (cf. also Stark 2002).

Second, 'zero' can no longer be seen as the simple absence of determination in the Old Italian determination system, but it seems to possess a precise 'classification value'. Consider the following example, drawn from a historiographical text :

- (1) ...e' seppe sì fare e sì provvedutamente temporeggiare, che al tempo del maggiore bisogno, come i' penso raccontare, egli ebbe *degli amici*, e non *parenti*, che l'atarono e sostennello per modo che non gli fu fatto torto... (Morelli, III, 372)

Telling a story about a successful merchant in Florence, Morelli mentions the fact that he managed to find some friends (*degli amici*) who sustained him, instead of relatives (*e non parenti*), which, as can be inferred, would have been less useful. Both nouns, *amici* and *parenti*, are of the same lexical class, but it is the friends, not the relatives, which will be commented in the following text and which are highly SPECIFIC referents. 'Zero' can therefore be considered as one means of indicating NON-SPECIFICITY, as postulated in many previous studies on article grammaticalization in Romance (see above, chapter 1.2), and the partitive plural as indicating SPECIFICITY (see above), just like in modern standard Italian.

Third, we discovered the relevance of different 'discourse traditions' (see above, chapter 3.2) for the distribution and functional load of our different indefinite determiners: there are exceptionally numerous "abstract nouns" in the group of expository-argumentative texts with *uno* and / or the partitive, like in the following example:

- (2) ...così ameremo come se quando che sia aremo essere non amici, così qui noi reggeremo le inimicizie, come se in tempo aremo da essere insieme non odiosi e infesti. Questo me par *della inimicizia*, se già qui altro voi non richiedessi. (Alberti, IV, 120)

This phenomenon derives directly from the main subjects of these texts, i.e. philosophical, sociological (such as friendship and enmity in example 2) and even linguistic problems, all having "abstract nouns" referring to their major text referents. Now, if *uno* (and in the beginning of its appearance in the *Trecento* also the partitive singular) is rightly considered as a device to highlight important, SPECIFIC text referents (cf. Stark 2002), it is not surprising that this textual function can slightly override the normal 'classificational function' (see below). On the other hand, we found most occurrences of the partitive singular in the novellas and historiographical texts, because "mass-denoting nouns" were more likely to denote important objects in narrative texts than in expository-argumentative ones.

As for a potential 'classification system' via DETERMINATION in indefinite noun phrases (see conclusion), it can best be identified in the singular in historiographical texts (see table 4 in the appendix). That the distribution of *uno*, the partitive and 'zero' in singular indefinite NPs is best described as a 'classification system', can be shown by some conversion phenomena we found in the corpus texts, as in the following two examples:

- (3) E però, con ciò sia cosa che lo consentire è *uno confessare*... (Convivio, I, chap. 2, p.10)
- (4) Unde, a nui tornando, dico che non multo [lontano] da la città, de la quale quanto sia piacevole il luoco, il nome in parte lo dimostra, [era una villetta], ne la quale non è gran tempo che essendo un preite, donno Battimo nominato, il quale, ancora che de villa fosse, pur *del pratico e de l'intendente* avea... (Masuccio, V)

In order to derive a deverbal "abstract noun" (*uno confessare*) out of an infinite verb form, which denotes an event or an action with a 'time contour', Dante chooses *uno*. On the other hand, Masuccio chooses the partitive to derive deadjectival "abstract nouns" (*del pratico, de l'intendente*) denoting properties without 'contour'. Both seem to classify the resulting "abstract nouns" or more precisely their referents according to their COUNTABILITY, or, at least, according to their 'object-like', 'contoured' vs. 'substance-like', 'diffuse' status.

4. Conclusion

This is then exactly what table 4 in the appendix shows most clearly (especially for historiographical texts): Old Tuscan, like the modern central Romance languages (Italian, French) in general, possesses a CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM via indefinite DETERMINATION (coding obligatorily APPREHENSION, as identification of the referent is not possible): 'Zero' does not indicate mere absence of reference and only sometimes NON-SPECIFICITY; its important role lies in nominal classification, indicating "abstract nouns", together with the partitive. *Uno* indicates COUNTABLE and the partitive UNCOUNTABLE NPs, classifying the respective referents as 'shaped objects' vs. 'diffuse substances', irrespective of the lexical class of the noun. They become grammaticalized in exactly this function, also in NON-SPECIFIC contexts (cf. Stark 2002), which reveals COUNTABILITY as a grammatical feature of early Romance / Old Italian and modern Romance noun phrases.

Finally, there seems to be a typological correlation concerning DETERMINATION and COUNTABILITY: the more the declension classes and the morphological marking of gender and number are lost in a Romance language, the more NOMINAL CLASSIFICATION (and NOMINAL DETERMINATION in general) is grammaticalized (cf. French vs. Rumanian with Italian in a 'middle position'). More research has to be done in this field, however, in order to discover the genuine original function of indefinite determiners in Romance.

Selected References

Texts analyzed

in OVI und BIT via Internet; addresses:

Opera del Vocabolario Italiano <<http://www.csovi.fi.cnr.it>>

Biblioteca Telematica Italiana <<http://www.cibit.unipi.it>>

and LIZ (*Letteratura Italiana Zanichelli* 2.0).

Allan, Keith 1980: Nouns and countability. *Language* 56:3, 541–567.

Behrens, Leila 1995: Categorizing between lexicon and grammar. The MASS/COUNT distinction in a cross-linguistic perspective. *Lexicology* 1:1, 1–112.

Blazer, Emily Deering 1979: *The historical development of articles in Old French*. Austin: University of Texas at Austin (PhD diss.).

Buridant, Claude 2000: *Grammaire nouvelle de l'ancien français*. Paris: Sedes.

Christopherson, Paul 1939: *The articles: A study of their theory and use in English*. Copenhagen: Munksgaard.

Corbett, Greville G. 2000: *Number* (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Coseriu, Eugenio 1955: Determinación y entorno. Dos problemas de una lingüística del hablar. *Romanistisches Jahrbuch* 7, 29–54.

Dryer, Matthew S. 1989: Article-noun order. *Papers from the 25th Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 83–97.

Elvira, Javier 1994: Un(o) en español antiguo. *Verba* 21, 167–182.

Forsgren, Mats 2001: Le référent existe – je veux bien, mais comment ?; in: Kronning, Hans et al. (eds.): *Langage et référence. Mélanges offerts à Kerstin Jonasson à l'occasion de ses soixante ans* (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Romanica Upsaliensia; 63). Uppsala: Uppsala University Library, 173–185.

Gaeng, Paul A. 1990: La flexion nominale à l'époque du latin tardif : essai de reconstruction; in: Calboli, Gualtiero (ed.): *Latin vulgaire – latin tardif II. Actes du IIème Colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif* (Bologne, 29 Août–2 Septembre 1988). Tübingen: Niemeyer, 111–128.

Gil, David 1987: Definiteness, noun phrase configurationality, and the count-mass distinction; in: Reuland, Eric J. / ter Meulen, Alice G. B. (eds.): *The representation of (In)definiteness* (Current studies in linguistics series; 14). Cambridge MA: MIT Press, 254–269.

Givón, Talmy 1981: On the development of *one* as an indefinite marker. *Folia Linguistica Historica* 2, 35–53.

Haspelmath, Martin 2001: The European linguistic area: Standard Average European; in Haspelmath et al. (eds.), vol. 2, 1492–1510.

— / König, Ekkehard / Oesterreicher, Wulf / Raible, Wolfgang (eds.) 2001: *Language typology and language universals / Sprachtypologie und sprachliche Universalien / La typologie des langues et les universaux linguistiques. An international handbook / Ein internationales Handbuch / Manuel international* (HSK; 20), 2 vols. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hawkins, John A. 1978: *Definiteness and indefiniteness. A study in reference and grammaticality prediction*. London: Croom Helm.

Heim, Irene 1988: *The semantics of definite and indefinite noun phrases*. New York: Garland Publishing.

Heinz, Sieglind 1982: *Determination und Repräsentation im Altfranzösischen* (Romanica Monacensia; 21). München: Fink.

Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. 2001: Articles; in Haspelmath et al. (eds.), 831–841.

Hofmann, Johann Baptist 1997: *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik: mit dem allgemeinen Teil der lateinischen Grammatik. Neubearbeitet von Anton Szantyr* (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft; II.2.2). München: Beck (2nd reprint of the edition of 1965/1972).

Kamp, Hans / Reyle, Uwe 1993: *From discourse to logic. Introduction to model-theoretic semantics of natural language, formal logic and Discourse Representation Theory*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Kemenade, Ans van / Vincent, Nigel 1997: Parameters and morphosyntactic change; in: id. (eds.): *Parameters of morphosyntactic change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1–25.

Krifka, Manfred 1991: Massennomina; in von Stechow / Wunderlich (eds.), 399–417.

Kühner, Raphael / Stegmann, Carl 1955: *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache. Satzlehre. Erster Teil*. Leverkusen: Gottschalksche Verlagsbuchhandlung.

Lehmann, Christian 1991: The Latin nominal group in a typological perspective; in: Coleman, Robert (ed.): *New studies in Latin linguistics. Selected papers from the 4th International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics, Cambridge, April 1987* (Studies in Language Companion Series; 21). Amsterdam / Philadelphia: Benjamins, 203–232.

Leiss, Elisabeth 2000: *Artikel und Aspekt. Die grammatischen Muster von Definitheit* (Studia Linguistica Germanica; 55). Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Link, Godehard 1991: Plural; in von Stechow / Wunderlich (eds.), 418–440.
- Löbel, Elisabeth 1993: On the parametrization of lexical properties; in: Fanselow, Gisbert (ed.): *The parametrization of Universal Grammar* (Linguistik Aktuell; 8). Amsterdam / Philadelphia: Benjamins, 183–199.
- Lyons, Christopher 1999: *Definiteness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 2000: The origins of definiteness marking; in: Smith, John Charles / Bentley, Delia (eds.): *Historical Linguistics 1995. Selected papers from the 12th International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Manchester, August 1995*, vol. 1: *General issues and Non-Germanic Languages* (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory; 161). Amsterdam / Philadelphia: Benjamins, 223–241.
- Meisterfeld, Reinhard 1998: *Numerus und Nominalaspekt. Eine Studie zur romanischen Apprehension*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- 2000: Die unbestimmte Bestimmung: Zur Entstehung des unbestimmten Artikels in den romanischen Sprachen; in: Staib, Bruno (ed.): *Linguistica romanica et indiana. Festschrift für Wolf Dietrich zum 60. Geburtstag*. Tübingen, Narr, 303–332.
- Moravcsik, Edith A. 1969: Determination. *Working Papers on Language Universals* 1, 63–98.
- Nocentini, Alberto 1990: L'uso dei dimostrativi nella *Peregrinatio Egeriae* e la genesi dell'articolo romano; in: *Atti del convegno internazionale sulla Peregrinatio Egeriae. Nel centenario della pubblicazione del Codex Aretinus 405 (già Aretinus VI, 3). Arezzo, 23–25 ottobre 1987*. Arezzo: Accademia Petrarca di Lettere, Arti e Scienze, 137–158.
- Oesterreicher, Wulf 2001a: Sprachwandel, Varietätenwandel, Sprachgeschichte. Zu einem verdrängten Theoriezusammenhang; in: Schaefer, Ursula / Spielmann, Edda (eds.): *Varieties and consequences of literacy and orality. Formen und Folgen von Schriftlichkeit und Mündlichkeit. Franz Bäumel zum 75. Geburtstag*, Tübingen: Narr, 217–248.
- 2001b: Historizität – Sprachvariation, Sprachverschiedenheit, Sprachwandel; in Haspelmath et al. (eds.), vol. 2, 1554–1595.
- Schultz-Gora, Oskar 1973: *Altprovenzalisches Elementarbuch* (Sammlung romanischer Elementar- und Handbücher, 1. Reihe: Grammatiken; 3). Heidelberg: Winter.
- Seiler, Hansjakob 1978: Determination: A functional dimension for interlanguage comparison; in Seiler (ed.), 301–328.
- (ed.) 1978: *Language Universals. Papers from the Conference held at Gummersbach / Cologne, Germany, October 3–8, 1976* (Tübinger Beiträge zur Linguistik; 111). Tübingen: Narr.
- 1986: *Apprehension. Language, object, and order. Part III: The universal dimension of Apprehension* (Language Universals Series; 1:3). Tübingen: Narr.
- Selig, Maria 1992: *Die Entwicklung der Nominaldeterminanten im Spätlatein. Romanischer Sprachwandel und lateinische Schriftlichkeit* (ScriptOralia; 26). Tübingen: Narr.
- Stark, Elisabeth 2002: Indefiniteness and specificity in Old Italian texts. *Journal of Semantics* 19:3, 315–332.
- Stechow, Arnim von / Wunderlich, Dieter (eds.) 1991: *Semantik. Ein internationales Handbuch der zeitgenössischen Forschung* (HSK; 6). Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Werner, Heinz 1998: Artikelentstehung und Verlust der Kasusflexion in der Romania im Licht eines modifizierten word-and-paradigm-Modells. *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 114, 381–413.

Appendix

SINGULAR	uno		partitive		'zero'	
<i>Trecento</i>	573		9		109	
"mass"	21	3,66%	7	77,78%	26	23,85%
abstract	169	29,49%	—	—	78	71,56%
<i>Quattrocento</i>	552		19		126	
"mass"	24	4,35%	14	73,68%	28	22,22%
abstract	201	36,41%	1	5,26%	92	73,02%
<i>Cinquecento</i>	580		2		154	
"mass"	4	0,69%	2	100,00%	11	7,14%
abstract	223	38,45%	2	100,00%	108	70,13%

Table 2. *Uno*, partitive and 'zero' with "mass-denoting nouns" / "abstract nouns" in singular NPs in the three periods

PLURAL	partitive		'zero'	
<i>Trecento</i>	11		120	
"mass"	—	—	—	—
abstract	1	9,09%	42	35,00%
<i>Quattrocento</i>	34		120	
"mass"	—	—	—	—
abstract	9	26,47%	58	48,33%
<i>Cinquecento</i>	42		112	
"mass"	—	—	—	—
abstract	—	—	36	32,14%

Table 3 (left). Partitive and 'zero' with "mass-denoting nouns" / "abstract nouns" in plural NPs in the three periods

SINGULAR	uno		partitive		'zero'	
novellas	579		17		131	
"mass"	11	1,90%	13	76,47%	31	23,66%
abstract	190	32,82%	2	11,76%	79	60,31%
historiography	562		12		141	
"mass"	2	0,36%	10	83,33%	7	4,96%
abstract	139	24,73%	—	—	103	73,05%
expositional-argumentative	565		1		117	
"mass"	36	6,37%	—	—	27	23,08%
abstract	265	46,90%	1	100,00%	96	82,05%

Table 4. *Uno*, partitive and 'zero' with "mass-denoting nouns" / "abstract nouns" in singular NPs in the text groups

PLURAL	partitive		'zero'	
novellas	20		142	
"mass"	—	—	—	—
abstract	6	30,00%	49	34,51%
historiographic	28		85	
"mass"	—	—	—	—
abstract	4	14,29%	22	25,88%
expositional-argumentative	39		125	
"mass"	—	—	—	—
abstract	—	—	65	52,00%

Table 5. Partitive and 'zero' with "mass-denoting nouns" / "abstract nouns"
in plural NPs in the three text groups